

REMARKS

Claim 1 is directed to a self-attaching nut for attachment to a panel wherein the nut includes a central pilot portion, a flange portion surrounding the pilot portion including an annular end face substantially parallel to an end face of the pilot portion, an annular groove in the end face of the flange portion including an inner side wall adjacent the pilot portion, a bottom wall spaced below the plane of the end face and an outer side wall extending to the annular end face inclined toward the pilot portion, thereby forming a restricted opening to the annular groove adjacent the end face of the pilot portion, and wherein the bottom wall of the annular groove includes “a plurality of circumferentially spaced radial ribs integral with said outer wall of said annular groove *extending radially beyond a midportion of said bottom wall of said annular groove spaced from said inner side wall,*” and wherein the spaced radial ribs each include a top face spaced below the bottom wall of the annular groove and opposed planar side faces preventing rotation of the self-attaching nut to a panel deformed into the annular groove against the bottom wall.

As set forth in the specification of this application, it was found that optimum torque resistance is provided where the radial ribs extend or are generally adjacent to the junction of the inner wall and the bottom wall, but that where the radial ribs *are not* integral with the inner wall, there is a likelihood of thread distortion or distortion of the thread cylinder through the central pilot portion and that this embodiment further assures substantially complete filling of the undercut formed by the inclined inner side wall of the annular groove. See paragraph [00007] bridging pages 4 and 5.

Further, new Claim 21 specifically recites that *both* the inner and side walls are inclined toward each other forming a dovetail-shaped annular groove having significantly increased push-off strength compared to the prior art, wherein only the inner wall of the annular groove is

inclined. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 21 patentably define over the prior art and thus the Species Restriction Requirement should be withdrawn.

Further in response to the Restriction Requirement, Claims 1, 6, 8 and new Claim 21 are generic to both Species A and Species B. Claims 2, 3, 9, 10 and 11 to 17 are specifically directed to the elected Species A and Claims 4, 6, 7 and 18 to 20 are specific to Species B as required by the Examiner in the Restriction Requirement. However, as set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the generic claims patentably define over the prior art and thus the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement.

Enclosed is our check in the amount of \$250.00 as required for the filing of this Amendment. If there are any additional fees due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge our Deposit Account for those additional fees or credit the account for any overpayments regarding this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.


Raymond E. Scott, Reg. No. 22,981
The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite 101
39400 Woodward Avenue
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304-5151
Telephone: (248) 723-0306

Dated: January 5, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING

I hereby certify that the enclosed **Amendment** and fee are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee," Mailing Label No. **EV489349745US** and addressed to Mail Stop Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on **January 5, 2005**.


Tracy L. Smith